

II.—THE TWO RECENSIONS OF PLAUTUS, *A* AND *P^A*.

Our manuscript evidence for Plautus consists in reality of two ancient texts. One of them, the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), still exists in a fragmentary and often illegible condition; the other (*P^A*), the proto-archetype of all other existing MSS, disappeared in or about the tenth century. Shortly before the disappearance of *P^A*, at least two copies of it were made, both of which are now lost. The contents of part of one copy we know from that collation of the Codex Turnebi (*T*) which was recently discovered in the Bodleian Library; the contents of the other (*P*) we can infer from a comparison of its descendants, our existing minuscule MSS, *B*, *C*, *D*, etc. While *A* seems to have belonged to N. Italy, the home of *P^A* was apparently Central France. By a singular good fortune these two ancient texts represent two rival recensions or editions of our author.

The existence of discrepant versions of Plautus is only natural. His plays were revived on the stage some time after his death (cf. Cas. prol.); and stage-managers would inevitably find occasion to shorten one scene or lengthen another, or replace an old-fashioned word or phrase by its new equivalent. Side by side with this deterioration went the restorative labours of learned men like Aelius Stilo and Varro, who exerted themselves to discover the 'ipsa verba' of the ancient poet. In Festus' compendium of the Dictionary of Verrius Flaccus, a dictionary composed in the time of Augustus, four of the quotations from Plautus are cited in a double form—one form, we may surmise, being the actual composition of Plautus, while the other is the alteration of some stage-manager. The Grammarian Charisius, who lived about the time when *A* (perhaps also *P^A*) was published, speaking of a passage in the *Bacchides* (v. 545), says 'it is not found in some copies' (in quibusdam non ferunt). If one applied for a copy of Plautus from a bookseller of, let us say, the fourth century A. D., one would, I fancy, have to specify which edition was wanted, just as nowadays one might select either the 'actor's' edition or the 'student's' edition of Shakspeare. Under the conditions that regulated the publishing of books in the ancient world, it would

be impossible for these separate editions to retain in full their different characteristics; for the setting of a verse in one recension would often be entered as a variant in the margin of a copy of the other recension; and when a transcription came to be made of the volume, these marginal (or interlinear) adscripts would often find their way into the text, producing 'mixed' versions. Aulus Gellius in his gossip about the books and booksellers of his time makes allusion to such a state of things. He mentions, for example (Noct. Att. IX 14), that in copies of the History of Claudius Quadrigarius he found the genitive form *facies* with *facii* added in the margin (sed 'facies' in ordinem scriptum fuit, et contra per i geminum 'facii').

Our two survivals (if we may include *P^A* under this designation) from the vast number of copies of Plautus in the ancient Roman world—one of them, as we have seen, a publication of N. Italy, the other of Central France—shew, both of them, traces of this 'mixture' of text. In the main they are representatives of two distinct recensions. Thus *A*, in whose extant fragments three of the four passages are preserved, which Festus cites in divergent form, exhibits in each of the three the one variant mentioned by Festus, while *P^A* exhibits the other: the Bacchides passage specified by Charisius is omitted in *A*, but is present in *P^A*; and we may congratulate ourselves on the extraordinary good-nature of Fortune which has determined that, although only two ancient texts have been transmitted to us, these two should represent the two rival forms in which the text of Plautus seems to have been presented to the ancient world. But, as an example or two will shew, it would be a mistake to regard our two survivals as if they were two standard copies, such as might be preserved in a national library as perfect specimens of the rival recensions. In Pseud. 864 one recension ended the line with *conquiniscito*, the other with *ceueto simul* (a reading preserved for us by Nonius). *Conquiniscito* is the reading of *A*, but in *P^A* we find the unmetrical ending *conquiniscito simul*:

si cónquiniscet istic, cónquiniscito simul.

The reading of the other recension had been written above the line:

conquiniscito
si conquiniscet istic, ceueto simul,

and had been mistaken by a transcriber for a correction of the word *ceueto*. Similarly in Pseud. 392 the rival versions were:

ex multis, exquire ex illis unum qui certus siet (P^A),

and

ex multis, ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.

The latter version was that of the archetype of A . But the intrusion of the variant *al(ias) exquire ex illis* into some copy has produced this 'mixed' version in A :

ex multis atque exquire ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.

In these two examples the reading of the rival recension has only blurred, not wholly effaced, the original version. But in Pseud. 955 only one of the rival versions appears in our two texts:

nón prorsus, uerum éx transuerso cédit, quasi cancér solet,

the other, apparently the genuine form, would have been lost to us, had it not been for a citation by Varro (L. L. VII 81):

út transuersus, nón prouersus, cédit, quasi cancér solet.

We must therefore see in A and P^A copies indeed, but only 'blurred' copies, of two distinct recensions of Plautus.

Another cause that has confused their outlines is the inevitable tendency of scribes to make mistakes. The immediate original of A has, we may be sure, by no means been faithfully transcribed in A itself, and the remote archetype of A is still less faithfully reproduced. The case of P^A is even worse. In the parts for which we have not the evidence of T , all that we can appeal to is the testimony of P ; and who can say how many errors have been made by the mediaeval German monk (or monks) who transcribed P ? Could we discover P^A , we should certainly find that in scores of passages it had identically the same text as A , where our MSS— B , C , D , etc.—all exhibit a divergent reading, a reading that originated in the carelessness of the scribe of P . Here are some examples which the newly found collation of T has revealed to us: Pers. 536 *mihī* AP^A , om. P ; 629 *eueniant* AP^A , *conueniant* P ; Poen. 310 *quia* AP^A , *qui* P ; 472 *quom* AP^A , *quo* P ; 860 *dignus qui siet* AP^A , om. P ; 977 *punicast guggast homo* AP^A , om. P ; 1019 *tu aliud sapis* AP^A , *tua* P ; 1036 *tu* P , om. AP^A ; 1204 *addunt* AP^A , om. P . And on the other hand a great deal of the apparent harmony of A with our minuscule MSS is equally specious. In Pseud. 1326 the mistake of *reddi* for *redi* is found in A . It did not appear in P^A , nor yet in P , but it intruded itself into that transcript of P which was the original of our MSS, C and D . In Trin. 530 the same mistake, *reddit* for *redit*, is

found in *A* and in *P*. But how can we be sure that it was also found in *P^A* and did not first intrude itself into that transcript of *P^A* which we call *P*? Errors of this kind are at all times a temptation to a scribe, and there is every possibility that the scribe of *A* and the scribe of some text of the other recension fell into them independently. We have therefore no right to take for granted, as is generally done, that *A* and *P^A* exhibited a 'consensus' in such errors as Trin. 773 *gererem* for *gerere rem*, Pseud. 98 *libellae* for *libellai*, Poen. 876 *resistam* for *res sistam*, 669 *accurres* for *accures*. It is extraordinary how many writers on the subject of the two recensions of Plautus have assumed that, because natural miswritings like these are found in our extant minuscule MSS, they must have been present in *P^A*, and even, a still more dangerous inference, that their presence in *A* proves that they existed in some imaginary original from which both *A* and *P^A* were derived. A much less natural miswriting, *hamum* for *hamulum*, has been made in Stich. 289 independently by the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and by the scribe of *A* (or the original of *A*). The reading of *P^A* and of *P* (as of *B*) was *hamulum*. Had *B* not retained the true form, we should have imagined that *hamum* was the reading of *P* and of *P^A* (cf. Pers. 572 *anulum* for *anellum*). The discovery of the collation of *T* has opened our eyes to the number of errors introduced into the text for the first time by the scribe of *P*. Great care, therefore, is necessary in compiling a list of the passages in which *A* and *P^A* exhibit either on the one hand a divergence of reading, or on the other a 'consensus' in error. And even when we have clear evidence for the reading of *A* and *P^A*, we have still to assure ourselves whether *A* and *P^A* in this respect offer a faithful or a blurred reflection of the two rival recensions from which they have sprung.

The problem, therefore, of reconstructing the two ancient recensions of Plautus is as difficult as it is fascinating. The more ancient and therefore presumably genuine form is the reading of *A* in a large number of passages, e. g. Pseud. 432 *fors fuat an istaec A, forsitan ea tibi P*; Trin. 88 *quid siet A, quicquid est P*; Pseud. 315 *meliora faxint and face A, melius faciant and fac hoc P*; Truc. 197 *opperimino A, opperire ibi P*. But not always, e. g. Trin. 328 *nisi tu nonuis A, si tu non neuis P* (unless the *A*-reading is a corruption of *nisi tu noenu uis*). Truc. 375 *rei pepercisses A, rei item parsisses P* (Spengel proposed *repercisses*

as the true reading and the reading in the original of *A*). In Trin. 70, *A* preserves the old form *obiurigem*, which in *P* shews a questionable 'modernized' form, designed to save the metre, *obiurgitem*; but in v. 68 it is *A* which has *obiurgitem*, while *P* has *obiurgem*. A curious variation is Stich. 586 *sustentatum est* *A*, *sustentaui* *P*; Truc. 369 *ambulatumst* *A*, *ambulasti* *P*. Interesting, too, is Truc. 245 *demum oggerunt* *A*, *demus danunt* *P*. In Poen. 343 the apparently unmetrical ending of *A* seems to be a concession to decorum. There is an alternative passage in iambic senarii to take the place of the lyric canticum at the beginning of the Stichus in *P*, but not in *A*.

The newly found collation of *T* has thrown a good deal of light on the arrangement of the cantica in *P*^A; for *T* retained the line-division of *P*^A, while *P* often departed from it by writing two short lines as one, for the sake of saving space. We now know that *P*^A exhibited the same method of colometry as *A*, the longest lines beginning at the extreme left-hand margin of the page (ἐν ἐκθέσει), the shortest near the middle of the page (ἐν εἰσθέσει). This method is often followed nowadays in printed texts of the Latin and Greek dramatists, and is not so remote from our usage as the practice, already mentioned, of inserting variant readings in the margin or between the lines; whereas in our books they are printed at the bottom of the page. Another kind of marginal adscript, equally productive of error, was employed for the sake of indicating that this or that passage might or should be omitted in acting the play. The method of indicating this seems to have been to adscribe at the beginning of the passage the line or lines which immediately follow the passage and which were themselves rewritten at their proper place. This extraordinary practice has, as may be imagined, led to great confusion. Thus in Trin. 361 sqq., where Lysiteles is talking with his father, Philto:

Lys. Ne opprobra, pater; multa eueniunt homini quae uolt, quae neuolt.

PHIL. Mentire edepol, gnate, atque id nunc facis haud consuetudine.

nam sapiens quidem pol ipsis fingit fortunam sibi:

eo non multa quae neuolt eueniunt, nisi fictor malust.

Lys. Multa illi opera opust ficturae, qui se fictorem probum 365

uitae agundae esse expetit: sed hic admodum adulescentulust.

PHIL. Non aetate, uerum ingenio apiscitur sapientia;

sapienti aetas condimentum, sapiens aetati cibust.

agedum eloquere, quid dare illi nunc uis? Lys. Nil quicquam, pater,

the possibility of omitting vv. 362-368 appears to have been

indicated in this or some similar fashion, with the result that in *A* v. 369 and in *P^A* both this line and its neighbour have been transposed to the place of v. 362. Strictly speaking, it would be natural to find the passage in one recension retained and in the other omitted; so that these marginal indications of feasible omission are perhaps due to 'mixture' of recensions. In the last scene of the *Captivi* the single line (v. 1023)

nunc edepol demum in memoriam régregiōr audisse me (A)

was in the other recension supplanted by a passage of seven lines (vv. 1016-22), ending with

nunc demum in memóriam redeo, cum mecum recógito;

and that the single-line version is the older and more genuine may be inferred from the old scansion *regrediōr* which it contains. Here too there is a trace of 'mixture'; for in *P* this older line appears in the text at the conclusion of the alternative passage, so that we have the meaningless repetition:

nunc demum in memoriam redeo, cum mecum recogito,
nunc edepol demum in memoriam regredior, audisse me
quasi per nebulam, Hegionem meum patrem uocarier.

(Omission of a passage through homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton must not be assigned to a difference of recension, e. g. *Epid.* 597-9 *om. A.*)

Besides divergence of words, phrases, and whole passages, there are other points of distinction between the two recensions. Often one arrangement of a canticum appears in one recension and a different arrangement in the other. *Pseud.* 1329 sq., for example, are in *A* treated as a long bacchiac series, but in *P^A* as a bacchiac trimeter catalectic followed by a long cretic series. There are other instances; and the list would no doubt be larger, if we had sure evidence (as supplied by *T* in the *Pseudolus*, *Poenulus*, *Persa* and *Rudens*) for the arrangement of the cantica throughout *P^A*. 'Mixture' of colometry is scarcely conceivable. The colometry of one recension might oust the colometry of the other, but could hardly be notified in the margin in the way that a variant reading or an alternative passage was indicated.

Again, the order of the plays was different. The order in the recension followed by *A* we do not know in the case of the first three plays. For the rest it was: *Bacch.*, *Capt.*, *Curc.*, *Cas.*, *Cist.*, *Epid.*, *Merc.*, *Most.*, *Mil.*, *Men.*, *Trin.*, *Truc.*, *Vid.*, *Poen.*, *Pers.*,

Pseud., Rud., Stich. The order in the other recension was: Amph., Asin., Aul., Bacch., Capt., Curc., Cas., Cist., Epid., Most., Men., Mil., Merc., Pseud., Poen., Pers., Rud., Stich., Trin., Truc., Vid. In *P* the Bacchides, in which play (v. 214) there is a mention of the Epidicus:

etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam aequae ac me ipsum amo,
nullam aequae inuitus specto, si agit Pellio,

was put after the Epidicus; but that in the archetype it stood after the Aulularia is shewn by the gap at the end of the one play (Aul. 832—fin.) and at the beginning of the other. The transposition may be due to some learned Carolingian abbot, under whose direction a transcript was made from *P*^A. Whether the curious position of the Trinummi, Truculentus and Vidularia in *A* should be attributed to the recension of which *A* is a copy or to the mistake of a transcriber¹ is not clear.

There is also a difference of scene-headings; but how far precisely the divergences may be traced past *A* and *P*^A to the rival recensions themselves is difficult to decide, partly because of the imperfect state of these headings in the Ambrosian Palimpsest in its present condition, partly because of an accident which interrupted the transmission of them in copies of the other recension (see Prescott, in Harvard Studies, vol. XI).

Nor should we lay too much stress on the presence of the didascaliae in *A* and their absence from *P*^A, nor yet on the absence from *A* (in its original form) of the arguments. There were two series of arguments for the plays, one series being acrostic; but we have hardly the right to assume that the one or the other series was a characteristic of the one or the other recension. The arguments are, of course, late compositions.

Now that we have full knowledge of the contents and form of *A*—thanks to Studemund's Apograph (Weidmann, Berlin, 1889)—and now that the newly found collation of *T* has thrown light on the contents and form of *P*^A, it is to be hoped that some one will undertake the task of reconstructing, so far as is possible, the ancient rival recensions of which these codices are representatives. The monographs of Niemeyer, *De Plauti fabularum recensione*

¹ Not of a binder; for at the end of the Menaechmi we read

T. [MACCI PLA]VTI
MENAECHMI EXP[L.] INC· TRINVM MVVS
FELICITER

duplici (Berlin, 1877), and Baier, *De Plauti fabularum recensio-nibus Ambrosiana et Palatina* (Breslau, 1885), were written before this knowledge of *A* and *P*^A was available. The full information, too, that Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* now provides regarding the glossaries or ancient dictionaries will facilitate the detection of readings in *A* or *P*^A which are rather errors of transcription, due to the substitution of a suprascript gloss for the actual word of the text, than varieties of reading. *Rogo*, for example, is the stock explanation of O.Lat. *oro* in the dictionaries of the Empire; and so *rogas*, the reading of *A* in Most. 682 (cf. *P*^A in Pers. 321):

bonum aequomque oras,

is not to be attributed to the recension which *A* embodies, but merely to the error of a scribe who found in his original

 rogas
bonum aequomque oras

and miscopied it as

bonum aequomque rogas.

Totus is similarly the stock explanation of O.Lat. *perpes*; and so *totam* was in some original of *A* written above *perpetem* (-*im*) in Truc. 278:

noctem in stramentis pérnoctare pérpetim.

The transcriber mistook the suprascript word, not for a correction (as in the line of the *Mostellaria* just quoted), but for an omission, producing in *A* the unmetrical line

noctem in stramentis pernoctare perpetim totam.

Care will be needed for the removal of such variants from the list of divergent readings of the rival recensions, and, on the other hand, in detecting a 'consensus' in error of *A* and *P*^A that has arisen through the same cause. In Poen. 1317, for example, *cur non*, the reading of *A* and of *P*, may not be the original reading of either recension, but may have found its way at different times into *A* (or some original) and *P*^A (or some original) through the suprascription of the gloss *cur non* over the word of the text, *quin*. Among other passages that may be mentioned in this connexion are: Merc. 300 *benest* A, *bonum est* P; 314 *plane decrepitus* A, *vetulus decrepitus* P (cf. Epid. 666); Pers. 408 *periure* A, *iniure* P^A; Pseud. 43 *impertit* A, *mittit* P; 232 *nihil curassis* A, *bene curassis* (if miswritten for *ne curassis*) P; 397 *neque paratust quicquam* A, *neque parata gutta* P; 417 *ante-*

ueniat A, *antecedat* P; 901 *fortiter* A, *firmiter* P^A; 1142 *ipsus ipsum* A, *ipsus coram* P; Stich. 455 *logis* A, *meis* P; 523 *ubi* A, *si* P; Trin. 1071 *hic* A, *ipsus* P; Truc. 260 *in nostra domo* A, *nostrae domi* P; 363 *puer* A, *mihī* P. Cas. 702 is an instructive example of how glosses marred the two texts:

ut nūbat mihī—illud quidē uolēbam,
nostró uilicó;

for the peculiar phrase *illud quidem uolebam*, 'I meant to say,' has brought glosses, but, fortunately, different glosses, into *A* (*dicere uolebam*) and *P* (*uolebam non sed*). In Mil. 599 the single gloss *auribus* seems to have occasioned the extra line in *P*.

A still more difficult task will be to determine what divergences of reading are due merely to faulty transcription of a scribe and are not to be referred to the ancient recensions themselves. The scribe of *P*, for example, when pressed for space seems to have followed a practice, unfortunately too common in early minuscule writing, of omitting the final syllable of a word and indicating the omission by a horizontal stroke above. A divergence of reading between *A* and our minuscule MSS that consists merely of difference of termination is often liable to suspicion on this account, e. g. Epid. 224 *facimus* A, *faciunt* BVEJ, where *P* may have had *facī* (i. e. *facimus*). Again, divergences like Stich. 435, *hasce* A, *eas* P, may not be real divergences of the ancient recensions. Both may have had *hasce*, but at some time or other in the transmission of the 'Palatine' text a scribe may have miscopied the unfamiliar word as *eas*. A careful estimate of the possibility and probability of faulty transcription by ancient or mediaeval scribes will greatly reduce the list of apparent divergences of reading in the two recensions. It will also diminish the examples of 'consensus' in error. The besetting sins of scribes of all periods, such as the 'modernizing' of archaic forms, haplography, etc., have been already mentioned; and a little study of the critical apparatus of the large Teubner edition of Plautus will convince us how inevitable are such corruptions as *eueniat* for *euenat* (Trin. 41), *ut* for *uti* (Stich. 193 and passim), *possum* for *potis (pote) sum* (Pseud. 355), *opinor* for *opino* (Bacch. 487 and passim), *illi* (dat.) for *illic* (Mil. 351, etc.), besides *illic* (adv.) for *illi, illum* for *illunc* (Poen. 1302, etc.), *-ae* (gen.) for *-āi* (Pseud. 98, etc.), as well as misspellings like *habeas* for *abeas* (Pseud. 393), *scimus* for *simus* (Pseud. 683), *honestam* for *onustam* (Pseud. 1306), *hostium* for *ostium* (Most. 768). The newly found evidence of *T*

shews us how often such errors originated in *P* and were not found in *P*^A, even when they appear in *A* [e. g. Pers. 442 *quum* (*qum*) *P*^A, *quin* *AP*]. Similarly, the evidence of *B* shews us when they are to be referred to the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and not to the scribe of *P* (e. g. Trin. 371 *tolerabilis* *ACD*, *tolerabis* *P*; Mil. 374 *mihi possunt* *ACD*, *possunt mihi* *P*). No argument whatever regarding the ancient recensions can be based on 'consensus' in errors of this description, even though such 'consensus' could be established for *A* and *P*^A. In Poen. 365 we have the express testimony of Nonius and Gellius that Plautus wrote *mea delicia*. This O.Lat. unfamiliar form appears in the familiar guise *meae deliciae* in *A* and *P*^A; but it would be rash to assert that *meae deliciae* was the deliberate reading of the editor of one or other (or both) of the rival recensions, and not a mere mistake committed separately by transcribers of the text.

Other possibilities of specious, not real, 'consensus' in error are more difficult to determine. In Truc. 227 the alliteration of neighbouring words, which always furnishes a handle for transposition, has misled both the scribe of *A* and the scribe of *P*. The line runs:

meretricem similem sentis esse cóndecet,

but *A* offers *sentis similem esse* and *P* had *esse similem sentis*. Both scribes have made the same mistake of transposition, but, fortunately, their deviation from their original has taken different directions. All the same, there was an even chance of a 'consensus' in error whose accidental nature might have passed undetected. Similarly in Truc. 383:

quod tu híc me absente nóui negoti gésseris?

A's transposition is *me híc absente*, while *P*'s is *híc absente me*. Although there was no alliteration in this phrase to tempt to transposition, this error has been made independently by both scribes, but, fortunately, in different forms. In Men. 201:

Hércules haud aéque magno umquam ábstulit perículo,

the alliterative words have been transposed in the same way in both *A* and *P*, *haud Hércules*. But can we be sure that the error has not been made independently in the one text and in the other? Festus quotes the words in their proper order. In Mil. 727-9:

sícut merci prétium statuit quí est probus agoránomus:
 quae probast mers, prétium ei statuit, pró uirtute ut uéneat,
 quae ímprobast, pro mércis uitio dóminum pretio paúperat,

the similarity of the clauses led to omission, but, fortunately, not to the same omission, in *P* (*om. qui est—statuit*) and in *A* (*om. mers—improbast*). Like examples are *Poen.* 389 sqq., and apparently *Stich.* 262, etc. But the most irresistible of all temptations to a scribe was the temptation to haplography, to write a repeated word or syllable once instead of twice. It would hardly be rash to assert that there is not a repeated word or syllable in a line of Plautus which in some MS or other has not come to suffer haplography. If Plautus wrote :

Pseud. 443 Ὡ Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, quam pauci éstis homines cómmodi !,
Stich. 384 íam, iam non facio aúctionem : mi óbtigit heréditas,
Poen. 1272 cur, cúr numero estis mórtui, hoc exémplo ut pingerétis ?,
 969 cretást, cretast profécto horum hominum orátio,

we have no right to ascribe the haplography in *A* and *P* or *P^A* (*Zeû, iam, cur, cretast*) to a common original of *A* and *P^A*. Such a mistake would with the utmost ease be made independently by different scribes.

Of late there has been a tendency to minimize the indications of different origin of *A* and *P^A*, although these indications are so strong and unmistakable—difference of text, difference in arrangement of cantica, difference in the order of the plays. Cases of ‘mixture’ of text have been put forward as a proof that both recensions came from some original ‘variorum’ edition of the collected plays, an edition crammed with variant readings; and the divergence of the two recensions is referred to the choice by transcribers, now of the reading of the text, now of the marginal variant. It seems to me that the account given above—viz. that the reading of one recension came in course of time to be entered in the margin of the other recension, and from there found its way into the text—is a much more natural and likely explanation. In fact, we can trace the same process still going on in *A* and in *P^A* themselves (or their originals). In *Pseud.* 1207, *impium*, the reading of *P^A*, is entered in the margin of *A*, whose reading is *impurum*, while in *Pseud.* 880 what was a marginal (or interlinear) variant in the original has retained a place, but not its right place, in *A* (*tu illos P^A* and *A*-text, *tuos A*-margin). In *Pseud.* 1207 *abduceret*, the reading of *A*, is entered in the margin of *P^A*, whose reading is *arcesseret*, and so on. A study of the divergent readings of *A* and *P^A* leaves the impression rather of two different editions which had in many passages been assimilated through

the adoption by one of some readings of the other, than of two copies of the same edition which were beginning to exhibit points of dissimilarity. And yet some advocates of unity of origin for the two codices go so far as to ascribe certain apparent instances of 'consensus' in error to the existence of holes in the pages of this supposed original, and to estimate the number of lines which each imaginary page must have contained. This is surely to forget that *A* and *P^A* are two out of a vast number of ancient copies of Plautus, belonging to different parts of the Roman world, with as much likelihood of being related to each other as two copies of Shakspeare, published, let us say, at the interval of a century or half a century, the one at Glasgow and the other at Melbourne. The great argument used by the supporters of such theories is the 'consensus' in error of the two ancient codices. They confront us with an imposing list of lines in which the reading of *A* and of *P^A* is the same, and apparently erroneous. Year by year these lists grow smaller; for, as our knowledge of Plautine diction and prosody grows, we recognize the correctness of this or that reading supported by the 'consensus' of *A* and *P^A*. Before 1892, when Prof. Skutsch published the first volume of his *Forschungen*, with its interesting discovery of the suppression of final *ē* in *ille*, *nempe*, *inde*, *proinde*, etc., in Plautus' verse, just as in all literature in *atque* (*ac*), *neque* (*nec*), *neue* (*neu*), lines like *Stich. 175*:

quia inde iam á pausillo púero ridiculús fui

used to form a considerable part of these lists. *Rud. 538* will, I presume, be omitted from them, now that Prof. Skutsch has shewn us that *auderem* has its old pronunciation *aviderem*:

Qui? Quía auderem técum in nauem ascéndere.

The whole history of Plautine textual criticism in recent years has taught us that truth lies, if anywhere, in the 'consensus' of *A* and *P^A*, and that the danger in tampering with a reading supported by *A* alone or *P* (or *P^A*) alone is not nearly so great as the danger of discarding the combined testimony of the 'two witnesses.' No judge will arrive at a correct verdict who does not weigh the evidence. The evidence of *AP^A* must outweigh the single evidence of *P*. The practice of emending lines of Plautus without stating whether the reading which is impugned rests on the authority of *P* only, or of *P^A* only, or of *A* only, or of *A* and *P^A* combined, obscures the conditions of the problem

to the reader and encourages the writer to reject genuine readings too hastily. The whole weight of tradition supports the reading *penitus* (in its original sense of 'from inside') in Pseud. 132:

atque ipse egreditur pēnitus (*intus* edd.), periuri caput.

Are we as much justified in substituting *intus* in this line as we might be in a line for which we had no better evidence than the Carolingian MS *P*? In Stich. 704, does not the 'consensus' of *AP* in the reading *in lecticis* rather point to some Plautine coinage like *inlectice* (adv.) of the type of *accubuo* (Truc. 422)?

STICH. Nímium lepide in méntem uenit: pótius quam in subséllio
Cýnice hic accipimúr quam inlectice (*in lectis* edd.). SAG. Immo enim nimio
hic dúlcius.

Must we not retain their reading *stultitiis* in Trin. 509, and give *de* the sense of 'after' or 'in consequence of' (as in Cas. 415, etc.)?

nám is (*sc.* ager) de stultitiis (*dimitiis* edd.) meis
solús superfit praéter uitam rélicuos.

Should we disregard their testimony to the old trisyllabic form of *ergo* adv. (as *iurigo* of *iurgo*, *purigo* of *purgo*) in Poen. 1051?

patritus er<i>go hóspes Antidamás fuit?

Should we ignore their indication of an O.Lat. *fortasse est* like *necesse est* in Poen. 1004-5?

MIL. Fortásse medicos nós esse arbitrárier.

AGOR. SÍ ést (Si ita est *edd.*), nega esse: nólo ego errare hóspitem.

And is the phrase *in ius uos uolo* so impossible that we must suppose both *A* and *P^A* to be in error in Poen. 1225?

quíd istic? quod faciúndumst cur non ágimus? in ius uós uolo (*uoco* edd.).

Certainly, if we consider the number of lines supported by the 'consensus' of *A* and *P^A*, whose reading has been justified through advance in our knowledge of Plautus, we shall be inclined to predict that nearly every line so supported will prove to be free from error, unless there be an error into which *A* and *P^A* have fallen independently, like the 'modernizing' of an archaic form, e. g. *ridiculisissimos* for *ridiculissimos* (Stich. 389), haplography, or some other equally obvious miswriting, such as *illorum* for *Iliorum* (Bacch. 951), *atque euoca* for *atque uoca* (Poen. 1116), *Euolaticorum* for *E* (the 'nota personae') *uolaticorum* (Poen. 474), *optumi maxumi* for *opt. maxume* (Men. 574), *festiua mulier* for

festiuam mulier (Mil. 591). But to argue on the other side is much more easy, for one has ready to hand all the apparent instances of 'consensus' in error which have not yet received their explanation; and, although the number available is diminishing steadily, there still remains a sufficient quantity to provide a respectable case. A large list of instances is furnished by lines which shew hiatus. These, however, lose their force, if we are to believe (and I do not see how we can venture to disbelieve) Cicero's express statement that the early poets made extensive use of this license. To discuss the limits within which we may suppose Plautus to have used it would, however, take too much space here.¹

Even if real cases of 'consensus' in error, these lines with hiatus would hardly justify the theory of so close a relation between *A* and *P*⁴ as is assumed. Prof. Leo has shewn the likelihood that in the early Empire unrestricted hiatus was believed to be a feature of Plautine verse, and that a 'versus hians' would be accepted without question by all editors of Plautus. The strongest argument that has been produced in favour of the close relation of *A* and *P*⁴ is the appearance at Merc. 598 of two lines which belong to another part of the play (vv. 842-3). In *P*⁴ the passage stood so:

(CHAR.) sed isne est, quem currentem uideo? ipse est, ibo obuiam.	598
EVF. Diuom atque hominum quae spectatrix atque era eadem es	
hominibus,	842
spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago.	843
CHAR. Nunc, quod restat, ei disperii: uultus neutiquam huius placet; 599	
tristis incedit,—pectus ardet, haereo,—quassat caput.	600
Eutyche. EVF. Eu, Charine. CHAR. Priusquam recipias anhelitum, 601	

In *A* only the beginnings of the lines are legible. First comes a line beginning *sed isne* (v. 598), then a line (too long to be written in a single verse) beginning *di*—, then a line beginning *spes*, then a line beginning *nuncq*—, then a line beginning *se . . . q*—, then a line beginning *tr*—, then either one or two lines (perhaps a scene-heading) of which not a single letter can be read, then a line beginning *Eutyche* and ending *quam recipi[as] anhelitum*. The lines (vv. 842-3)

diuom atque hominum quae spectatrix atque era eadem es hominibus,
spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago

¹I have attempted to do so elsewhere, in the English Journal of Philology for this year.

are suitable in the place where they appear later in the play, after v. 841 (the leaves of *A* which contained this part of the play have been lost). There Eutyclus reappears on the stage, charged with joyful tidings,—not, as here, with a message of sorrow;—and it is argued that by some extraordinary mistake a scribe entered them in the margin or inserted them in the text at this place, and did not take the trouble to erase them. From a text marred by this blunder, it is said, both *P^A* and *A* have been transcribed. Another explanation is possible—namely, that Eutyclus, at his two appearances on the stage with his two messages, had much the same form of words put into his mouth by the dramatist, and that in *P^A* his utterance at his first appearance was by a blunder assimilated to his second utterance. If we could recover the rest of the two lines in *A*, they would, on this theory, exhibit their correct form. I do not think this piece of evidence for a close connexion of *A* and *P^A* is strong enough to overcome the mass of facts that speak against this connexion. And it is, so far as I know, the strongest piece of evidence that has yet been alleged.¹

W. M. LINDSAY.

¹ Poen. 1168 seems to be correctly preserved by *A* and (in the main) by *P^A*. *In* has the sense of 'like, after the fashion of':

AGOR. Sed eccás uideo ipsas. HAN. Haécine meae sunt filiae?
 quantae é quantillis íám sunt factae! AGOR. Scín quid est?
 Thraecaeé sunt; in celónem (*sunt celumne P^A*) sustollí solent.

On Mil. 1419, Stich. 620 see Seyffert in Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI (1896), p. 234. In Poen. 331, why may not *insecundo* (cf. Auct. ad Herenn. IV 56) be formed from *insequor* in the same way as *secundo* from *sequor*? In Cas. 571 *príus* is the original scansion of the word, and *contor*, the simple verb of which *percontor* is a compound, is by no means impossible; in Stich. 223 *Hercúlès te amabit* is a most natural parenthetical exclamation to an imaginary bidder; in v. 243 of the same play *eu ecastor* seems to be 'extra metrum,' like *attat* in Cas. 619 (cf. Mar. Vict. 85); in Pseud. 306 *iustus* need not be altered, nor in v. 442 *idné tū*; in Mil. 254 *quae mentibitur* has the same construction as Ennius' *uitam uiuitur* (where *uitam* can not be acc. of time).



3 0112 078042881